The Fifth and Sixth

OF THE

Controversial LETTERS:

OR THE

Grand Controversie,

Concerning

The pretended Temporal Authority of POPES over the whole Earth,

And the

True Sovereign of KINGS within their own respective Kingdoms.

Between two English Gentlemen,

The one of the Church of England:
The other of the Church of Rome.

LONDON,

Printed for *Henry Brome* and *Benjamin Tooke*, at the Gun; and at the Ship in St. *Pauls* Church-yard. 1673.

The Fifth and Sixth

OF THE

Controversial LETTERS

OR THE

Grand Controversie

Concerning

The pretended Temporal Authority of POPE [illegible]

And the

True Sovereign of KINGS with their own respective Kingdoms.

Between two English Gentlemen,

The one of the Church of England, the other of the Church of Rome.

LONDON,

[illegible]

FRIEND,

I Muſt confeſs I am ſomething better at eaſe, at leaſt I know not where to fix my jealouſie. I cannot ſay but the cauſe you aſſign may have had ſome influence upon me; for to hear men ſpoken againſt perpetually and univerſally, and not to think there is ſome fire to all that ſmoke, is hardly poſſible. Yet let me tell you, I think you have no great reaſon to complain; for, if I miſtake not, you owe a good number of your Proſelites to this very cauſe, and believe, that of thoſe who come over to you, far the greateſt part have been wrought upon by this perſwaſion, That you are ill repreſented. When you truly are ſo, as I cannot deny but ſometimes you are, 'tis no hard matter for you to ſhew it to candid people, whom nature has ſo diſpoſed to favour perſons wrongfully traduc'd, that this bad Idea, whereof you complain, makes you at laſt ſufficient amends. There is ſuch a charm in injur'd Innocence, that I am very confident it brings you in more Converts than all your Arguments. If ſome be hardned, others are gain'd; and peradventure fair play were more for the Intereſt of both ſides. However it be, I acknowledge I was my ſelf ſomething miſtaken in you, and not ſo well acquainted as I thought with your Religion, where things I perceive go otherwiſe than I apprehended. I thought there had been an Oraculous kind of luſtre in this power of the Popes, which had either dazled you into a blindneſs of not ſeeing ought againſt it, or aw'd you into a fear of ſaying what you ſaw, if you ſaw any thing, and for ought I perceive you are as cleer ſighted as other men, and ſpeak bold truths as freely. I muſt confeſs we are a little out when we impute blindneſs to you, at leaſt I'm ſure you ſaw more in this particular than I. But hark you Friend! while you diſcourſe

of one thing, my thoughts insensibly carry me to another. I begin to conceit this Tradition of yours which makes such a noise, and passes for such a bugbear, may prove less frightful than our apprehensions make it. And I cannot tell whether the Pope has not as much reason to be jealous of it as Protestants. For methinks, if that be made the Test of Doctrines, and nothing impos'd upon our belief but upon the warrant of the constantly conspiring attestation of all Ages; This deposing power of the Popes, which from its inconsistency with Civil government I so much abhorr'd, must needs be excluded from the Articles of belief, and Protestans eas'd of a great deal of pains in pulling down that which your own beloved Principle pulls down to their hands. For ought I know, it may do as good service upon other occasions; however I avow to you, I am more friends with it than ever I was, and think Protestants have no reason to look unkindly upon a Principle which takes their part so much in a question of such importance. I wish with all my heart it were look't into more throughly, for I mistake extreamly if it would not cut off a number of those things of which we complain, and though peradventure it be no discretion to speak so freely to you, reduce things to that pass, that while you labour to bring us over to you, That very instrument which you use to that purpose, may force you over to us. But rather than such a thing should happen, I presume the Pope would disown it, and after he has us'd it as long as it would serve his turn, turn enemy to It as soon as he finds It turn enemy to him. But to tell you truly, I am something in a better humour for Tradition, because you speak of Scripture with that reverence which is fit, and which pleases me so much the more by how much the less I expected it from you. For you know how ill you hear (pardon the pedantry of the phrase) for failing in the respect due to that sacred pledge of the Divine Love, which the fear, or rather consciousness how cleerly those undimmable lights would discover the abundance of tares you have sown amongst the wheat of the Gospel, makes you shut up from the Vul-

gar

gar, and exclude from the Test and Judge of Controversies. And after this, to profess they are divinely inspir'd, and that no other writings can be compar'd to them, is a thing which pleases indeed, but surprizes me too. Do you forget, or have you a mind to condemn your self? For the Spirit of God must certainly be Gods best Interpreter, and where that is to be had (as in books divinely inspir'd, the Divine Spirit must certainly be,) to seek another Judge is to refuse him now by whom we must one day be judg'd whether we will or no, and should do well not to provoke in the mean time by contempt. To tell you my thoughts freely, If you would give a little more to Scripture than you do, and we to Tradition, I think things might be better betwixt us. For you pretend to hate Novelties, as I am sure we do; All our whole Reformation being nothing else but the rejecting what you have introduc'd. Let us have but Gods Law pure as he gave it, and free from the mixture of erroneous additions or diminutions, and we have no more to desire. And if I understand Tradition rightly, and that it signifie what *Vincentius Lirinensis* has long since delivered for the test of Sound doctrine, *viz.* what has been held ever, and every where, and by all, methinks you should like Novelties no more than We: for novelty and this cannot consist together, and there needs no farther confutation of novelty, but only to shew that 'tis a Novelty. Which if it be so, in the name of God how fell we out? We all know that Christ was our only Lawgiver, and that upon the observation of the Law he gave us, all our hopes of Salvation depend; that since him there has been no new Law-maker, and whoever teaches any doctrine contrary to what was taught by him is long since declar'd Anathema by the Apostle: that profane Novelties are to be avoided, and those who broach or abett them are in the words of the *Psalmist*, wicked men who tell us stories, but not as thy Law, O God: And while we both agree in this, how is it possible we should disagree in ought? and what magick is it which thus sets up Altar against Altar, and divides the seamless coat of Christ? In the darkness

darkneſs of Barbariſm and Ignorance, things might more eaſily be obtruded upon us, but in an age ſhining with ſo much wit and learning, and ſo cleer ſighted in Antiquity, methinks it is no ſuch hard matter to find out at leaſt which is the Novelty, and then if *Vincentius* ſay true, we know without more ado which is the Truth. Seriouſly Friend, I am at a ſtrange loſs and cannot poſſibly unriddle this Myſtery. But my zeal tranſports me, and I have almoſt forgot what we were talking of. To return to your Letter: It is I muſt confeſs long enough, yet I wiſh it had been longer, and that you had inſiſted a little more upon ſome Points there. Particularly that of the Princes power, Whether it be *immediately* from God, or only *mediately?* 'Tis true, you ſay what thoſe who hold it *mediate* I conceive will have much ado to anſwer; but yet you ſay it ſhortly, and determine not the point. I confeſs it was not neceſſary you ſhould; mediate or immediate was enough for your deſign, but not for my curioſity. And becauſe I judge the point of importance enough to deſerve a little more pains, I beſeech you reſume it, and ſhew me a little more at large that the Tenet of immediate power is unreprovable amongſt you, if it be ſo. Another is the Spiritual power, which you ſay was only committed to the Pope; but what that Spiritual power is, you ſay not, and by that forgetfulneſs or reſervedneſs, or haſte of yours, leave me much at a loſs. This *Spiritual* power of yours, for ought I know, may do all that *Temporal* power can do; and then we are never the near, and Princes as unſafe as ever. If their work be taken out of their hands, and they peradventure out of their kingdoms by this which you call Spiritual power, you might ev'n as well have kept the Temporal power too for any kindneſs you have done us. For 'tis the Power of which we complain, and whether you call it temporal or ſpiritual, if it be a power to do miſchief, 'tis alike grievous to us. I am the more ſollicitous of this for *Bellarmin*'s ſake, and the ſtrange deſcant he runs upon that plain ground *Feed my ſheep*; a place he handles almoſt as odly, as he that on the word *Confirmavit*, made this gloſs,

gloſs (i.e.) *Abrogavit*; This Feeding, as he orders matters, amounting to little leſs than Deſtroying. A Shepheard, ſaies he, has to do with Wolves and Rams, and Sheep; and Princes, as he contrives it, are all Three. If they leave your Communion, or in his language, turn Hereticks, they are Wolves, and to prevent the miſchief they may do the flock, your Shepheard at *Rome* is impowr'd to drive them away by excommunication, and command the flock not to follow them, for ſheep you know naturally run after wolves; but yet I perceive no great neceſſity of excommunicating thoſe who have refus'd communion before. Then if retaining your Communion, They govern wickedly and wrong the Church by unjuſt Laws or actions, they are Rams, and your Shepheard is again impowr'd to ſhut them up, and reduce them to the condition of Sheep: Weathers methinks he ſhould have ſaid, for Rams ſeem to be a kind of Sheep, and Depoſing is his way of Gelding. Laſtly, all Chriſtians being Sheep, and Princes amongſt the reſt, your Shepheard may command and force them to do their duty; and the duty of Kings being to defend the Church and puniſh Hereticks, if they fail in this, he may puniſh and force them by excommunication and other convenient means; which convenient means is to depoſe them, and turn the Commonwealth topſy turvy, and fill the Country with rapine and bloud, and ſuch conveniences as War, and the worſt of wars, the Civil uſeth to produce. And all this is to feed the ſheep ſtill. In truth Friend, a little more would incline me to believe too, that the Bible is of too keen an edge for every body to manage; but I am not for all that of your Churches mind, for methinks 'twere better to keep it ſhut from the learned, and leave it to the ſimple, who at worſt would but cut their own fingers, and not their Neighbours throats. A plain man would never have found out, that *feeding* ſhould ſignifie putting folks into a condition of ſtarving. Fighting certainly is a new way of feeding, and ſure Chriſt did not mean his Sheep ſhould be fed with knocks. But to leave *Bellarmin* to his ſpeculations,

if

if this be what you understand by your Spiritual power, your Doctrine is inexcusable. *Carerius*, or whoever flies highest can give the Pope no more than all, and I see not that *Bellarmin* goes less. For if the Pope can command, and force Princes to obedience, and take them away, and set up others by his Spiritual power, I understand not what all the Temporal power in the world can do more. Wherefore either shew me a real difference betwixt these two Powers, and such an one as leaves them at peace one with another, and each quiet in his own sphere, or confess your Church teaches Doctrine incompatible with the security of Princes and quiet of the world; and that all you can do for her credit, is to raise a mist of words, which may serve to hide her shame a while, and steal your self from the difficulty, but when it breaks up, every body sees plain enough how things go.

Your very humble Servant!

FRIEND,

FRIEND,

THIS is and ever will be the fate of Diſputers. While they are intent upon one thing, ſome caſual expreſſion which they heed not, occaſions a new difficulty, and that many times diverts, ſometimes loſes the former inquiry. You have now ſtarted new game by your reflections upon *Scripture* and *Tradition*, which, though the Quarry peradventure be as good as that we had before us, yet is not the ſame; And as they require as much labour and diligence, twenty to one, we ſhall meet with freſh game in the purſuit of them, and tire our ſelves with variety of change and catch nothing. Permit me therefore to refer you for thoſe points to thoſe Writers of ours who have handled them profeſſedly and exactly. The Objections are ſo ordinary and ſo often anſwered that truly I expected them not from you, and doubt while you ſo much lay to heart what is ſaid againſt us, you conſider little what we reply, which methinks is not ſo agreeable to your candour. Otherwiſe 'tis eaſie to meet with information of what we ſay to thoſe things. But for your fears the Pope will not ſuffer us to ſtand to *Tradition*, let me briefly aſſure you they are vain. The Church has ſtood almoſt ſeventeen ages by it, and we ſhall not leave it till we have a mind to leave the Church. Popes are not the men you take them to be. 'Tis true they are men, and that a mixture of worldly conſiderations ſhould not ſometimes enter into their counſels, cannot be expected: but for all that they are good men, and ſo good, that you will not often find Princes more vertuous. It is ſo far from entring into their thoughts to aſſume to themſelves things prejudicial to the Church, that on the contrary 'tis the good of the Church which has been pretended to

gain admittance for these things which indeed are prejudicial, but which if they had not been thought otherwise had never gain'd admittance. And if you think He who owns himself *Father of the Church* will not rather cast off these pleasing flatteries, when he discerns them to be so, than hazard the good of the Church, allow him yet to understand Policy, and have wit enough to perceive that his well-being depends upon the well-being of the Church, and the constancy of his power, and greatness, and whatever you envy him for. Take away the Church, and He is no body. O Friend! could that cleer sight of yours look upon things without the Spectacles of *prejudice*, and consider the office without the *impossible* to be avoided faults of some persons, you would peradventure wonder at the aversion you have to a thing, so beneficial to Mankind, that the Divine Providence has left us few more signal testimonies of his constant care over us. At least for my part, I cannot but find my self obliged to a grateful acknowledgment of His love to the Church, as often as I consider he has appointed one whose office and duty it is to take care of her good, and placed him in such circumstances that to the efficacy of vertue and a good Conscience, Interest and the preservation of his own Concerns, and those great ones, and all the considerations which sway with men, are added to make him execute this Office well. A Common *Father* of Christendom obliged by Conscience and interest to procure the good of the whole, and disabled by want of the Material Sword which is committed to Princes from doing any great harm, (Power disarm'd you know, cannot be much mischievous,) is so great a good, that if the wisdom and goodness of God had not provided it for us, I am confident those who love Christianity would have wisht, and perhaps, fruitlessly endeavour'd to have set it up themselves.

But let us suppose the Popes as bad men as you will, suppose them to design the destruction of the flock they have undertaken to feed, to be careless of the place they hold in this world, and the account they are to give in the

the next, ſuppoſe them wicked, ſenſleſs and mad, To make the Church abandon *Tradition* is a thing beyond all the plenitude of His power. Hopes of happineſs, and Fear of miſery; Love to poſterity, and the Force of Nature, and Inclinations of Mankind, are things too deeply imprinted to be ſubject to any Awes or violence. But I have no intention to meddle with Controverſie, wherefore pray take it well that I refer you for more ſatisfaction, if you deſire it, to thoſe who do.

Then for the Reverence, which from the natural dictate of my thoughts, you find in my unheeded expreſſions concerning *Scripture* you wonder at it, and I more wonder at your wonder; Yours I ſay, who, if I miſtake not, uſe not to give your ſelf blindly up to the conduct of other mens Prejudices; but deſire firſt to ſee Reaſon, and then to follow it. In the name of God what have Catholics ever ſaid or done, that you ſhould fancy them to have leſs reſpect for Scripture than is due to it, or than other men have. We hear ill indeed as you ſay; but alas! 'tis becauſe other men ſpeak ill. Sure I am, 'tis we preſerv'd the Scriptures for fifteen hundred years, and if we had not, you had not had them to have reproacht us withal. You receiv'd them from us, and 'tis by our Atteſtation you know there are Books of Divine Inſpiration, and which they are; otherwiſe I know not vvhere you would have had them, nor how have known them. If you think vve read them not, and take no care to underſtand them; examine vvell the ſeveral Expoſitours, and ſee if the Proteſtants equal the Catholics either in Number or Learning. *But we keep them ſeal'd up from the Vulgar; and this for fear thoſe cleer lights ſhould too plainly diſcover the cracks of our Doctrine.* I know not how charitable you think that Comment, but I am ſure I find it very irrational. If they be againſt us in *Latin* 'tis a wiſe piece of pollicy, a deep reach of ſubtle craft to keep people from reading them in *Engliſh*; as if you had not Learning enough to urge them againſt us in Latin, or we to underſtand you unleſs you ſpoke Engliſh. But thus ſtands the Caſe, whoever

underſtands Latin needs no permiſſion to read the Scripture, and vvho does not may have it for asking, provided he be not of the number of the unlearned and unſtable, who deprave them to their own perdition. Such there were in St. *Peter*'s daies, and vve have but too much cauſe to feat the number is greater now; and if you think that to hinder the Perdition of men be to vvant Reſpect for Scripture, you may think as your Charity and Judgment ſerves you; but I think vve ſhall endeavour to ſhew ours by procuring their Salvation. The truth is, vve do little more in that particular than the Law, I think ſtill in force, obliges you to do. Look into the Statute, *Hen.* 8. and ſee vvith vvhat limitations the Reading of the Bible is permitted. If you obſerve them not, we indeed are more obedient to our Laws, than you to yours; but the Laws of both are much alike: for all this vvhile numbers of you read the Scriptures, and ſhew your reſpect to them in contempt of the Law, vvhich is a fine kind of reſpect. *But we refuſe them for the Judge of Controverſies, Conſcious*, ſay you, *that they would give ſentence againſt us.* Methinks men vvho impute vvant of Charity to us, ſhould be a little more vvary in making ſuch Conſtructions of things. But I beſeech you, What do you mean by *Judge of Controverſies?* If no more but this, that vvhatſoever is contained in thoſe Sacred Books is Truth, and Truth divinely inſpir'd, and ſuch as ought to be receiv'd by all vvith a ſubmiſſion ſo abſolute and entire, that no Authority on Earth is permitted to oppoſe or queſtion the leaſt title of it; and that, vvhen of any point in Controverſie, or not in Controverſie, the verdict of Scripture appears, there is no more to do, but immediately leave off diſputing, and receive it vvith the reverence and ſubmiſſion due to Divine Oracles. If this be all you mean, as I think it is, What Catholic ever deny'd, or queſtion'd, or doubted of it? We hold him neither Catholic nor Chriſtian that does. And as little as you think our Vulgar people acquainted vvith the Scriptures, I believe you vvill find few, vvho knows not thus much of them. Whether all this makes the title

of

of *Judge* belong vvith propriety to Scripture, you may, if you pleaſe diſpute vvith our Controvertiſts. But for the ſubſtance of vvhat vve hold; if this vvhich I have expreſt be that vvhich you hold, Catholics hold the ſame, and as fully and as firmly. I conceive, vvhen you affirm, and we deny Scripture to be the Judge (peradventure it might have been more proper to have ſaid, *Rule*) of Controverſie, vve mean not the ſame thing. For ſince all the excellent Prerogatives belonging to that Book, hinder it not from being a Book; and a Book muſt be made up of Words, and Words, and vvhat is ſignified by the Words, are different things; vve think it may be permitted us, vvithout contempt of Scripture, to think that difference is found in the Words of Scripture, as well as in all others. For certainly to forfeit our Reaſon is a very prepoſterous kind of reſpect. Now as far as I am acquainted vvith Controverſie, I conceive that when we deny it to be the Judge or Rule of Controverſie, we mean the Words abſtracting from the Sence; and when you affirm it is, you mean the Sence abſtracting from the Words: For methinks, you ſhould not hold your ſelves, or pretend to perſwade us, that material Sounds, or ſtroaks of the Air, or Lines drawn by a Pen, are that very Word of God to which ſo much Reſpect is due: eſpecially when after ſo long a courſe of time, vve have not the Original Words neither, at leaſt that vve know to be ſuch, vvhich the firſt Pen-men us'd; but Tranſlation upon Tranſlation, and ſuch variety of Copies, that there is no ſmall difficulty in the choice. Pray enquire, and ſatisfie your ſelf, vvhether this be not the truth of the buſineſs; for if it be, I ſee not that you give more to the Words than vve, and that vve give as much to the Sence as you. For nothing can be plainer than that this Poſition, *The Sence is the Rule*, is no contradiction to ours, *The Words are not the Rule*; vvhich two are ſo far from irreconcileable, that they have no oppoſition, and may, for ought appears in the Terms, be both true. The Terms in vvhich the Controverſie is ſtated, *Scripture* is, *Scripture* is *not* the Rule, are indeed contradictory; but

but what we mean by theſe Terms has no oppoſition. For you mean that the Truth contain'd in Scripture, is without exception, to be indiſputably believ'd by all; ſo that no Authority, whatever it be, on Earth, whether Pope or Church, can pretend any way to be exempted from entire ſubmiſſion to it; and this no Catholic denies. We mean the Words of Scripture, becauſe we ſee them daily wreſted to ſeveral Senſes, are not alone able to give us certainty which the true Senſe is. And this I conceive no Proteſtant bound to affirm. For you conſult the Fathers in difficulties where you are unſatisfi'd, and by their Authority either find, or juſtifie the Senſe in which you underſtand the Words. Wherefore 'tis very evident, that we deny not what you affirm, and you affirm not what we deny, and that our only contradiction in this Point, is the Contradiction of Words which we both ſo underſtand, that there is no contradiction in what we mean by them. For you ſay, We muſt believe what Scripture ſaies; and we ſay ſo too, We ſay, we cannot ſufficiently know by the bare Words alone, what Scripture ſaies, and we muſt believe; and you, I think, ſay not the contrary. Rule then with you, ſignifies Rule of Belief, or that which is to be believed; with us, the Means by which we muſt know what we are to believe. Which two are as different as may be, yet both being confounded in the ſame word *Rule*, make a ſhift with the aſſiſtance of the peeviſh animoſity, and ſtiff croſneſs of our unhappy times, to keep us ſtill at odds, and expoſe us to the reproach of being diſreſpectful to Scripture, for denying it to be the Judge or Rule of Controverſie, when all the while we agree to what you mean by *Judge* of Controverſie. *How quantum eſt in rebus inane!* In ſhort, give us the true Senſe of Scripture, and if we ſubmit not to it, with all the ready Obedience due to it, you ſhall not need to condemn us: Our public Profeſſions, beſides the ſelf conviction of Conſcience, will condemn us to your hands: but if we refuſe, to accept for Gods Word, a wrong Senſe of thoſe words in which 'tis expreſt, I think, we ſhew more re-

ſpect

ſpect to the Word by deſiring a true one, than thoſe who would impoſe a falſe one. For 'tis only the true ſence which is indeed Gods Word; and there is nothing farther from reſpect to it, than to accept a Falſe one inſtead of it. Pray, when a Presbyterian Interprets Scripture to the deſtruction of Epiſcopacy; or an Arian to the overthrow of Chriſt's Deity, or a Socinian of the Trinity; Are you diſreſpectful to Scripture for rejecting their Interpretations, or they for making them? This we take to be the Caſe betwixt you and us, and that you offer us wrong Sences of Scripture, and then blame us for want of Reſpect to Scripture for not accepting them. Whereof, whatever be the truth, which I will not meddle with, this is plain, that we do no more to you, than you to Sectaries; and therefore cannot be thought to have leſs reſpect for Scripture than your ſelves. I have read ſomewhere, and I cannot but think it true, that for all theſe ſcandalous imputations, there are none who ſhew that true reſpect to Scripture, which Catholics do. For beſides the Reverence we bear to the Sence, we have alſo an Authentic Copy of the words, to which we tye our ſelves, and cannot refuſe in Diſputation; whereas others take the liberty to fly from one Copy, and one Language to another, as beſt ſerves their turn; which a body would think, were a proceeding favour'd more of a deſire to juſtifie themſelves, than Reverence to thoſe Sacred Oracles. The truth is, the Controverſie betwixt us concerning Scripture, is not about the Word of God, in which we both agree, but of the Means to know it, and that plainly ſhews the true Word of God is ſubmitted to all hands. For otherwiſe, we need not much trouble our ſelves to find it out, or care what it ſaid, if we did not acknowledge it obliged us to Belief. And ſince you will not, I preſume, ſay, that a wrong Sence of the material words, is the true Word of God, or Divinely inſpired; all this hideous contempt, wherewith we are reproached, amounts to no more, than that we will not wilfully contradict our eye-ſight, but think the words both may,

and are too often wrested to vvrong meanings; that is, that the Material vvords are not vvhat they signifie: vvhich is just to say, A man must needs despise the Grape if he think the Bush is not the Wine. 'Tis strange an Objection of so little substance should be, or so obstinately prest, or so universally entertain'd. You too talk gravely for Company, and admonish us of refusing a Judge, to vvhom vve must one day submit our selves vvhether vve vvill or no; as if true desire to know his Sentence, and true submission to it vvhen vve do know it, vvere to refuse it. I do not know vve refuse any thing of Scripture, but your Interpretation, vvhere vve think you are in the vvrong; and I trust you vvill not say, your Interpretation is the Judge, vvho at the last day shall sit upon the quick and the dead. *But the Spirit of God is Gods best Interpreter*, say you, *and since that is to be had in Books Divinely inspir'd, we should seek no farther.* How prettily does this sound? and yet, hovv little does it signifie? To have the Spirit vvhich is in those Holy Books can mean nothing, that I knovv, but to knovv and beleive the Truth contained there. And then consider vvhat vvork your zeal makes of it. This Meaning is the thing about vvhich vve differ, you understand it one vvay, and vve another. That then, vvhich is to be Interpreted is the Meaning of Scripture, that vvhich you assign for Interpreter, is the Spirit, and this Spirit is the very Meaning. Is it possible you should not see, that this is to make the Interpreter, and the thing Interpreted all one? That it supposes the same thing, both understood, and not understood at once? Understood as Interpreter, not understood as Interpreted. Nay, that it makes one thing the same, and not the same vvith it self. For to Interpret, is to declare another thing; and yet this, which to be Interpreted must be another, you make the Interpreter it self. Pray persist not vvith your fine Language to perswade us, that is to be the Interpreter, vvhich vvhen vve once have, there is nothing to be Interpreted: for vvhen vve once have the Meaning, vvhich you call to *have the Spirit*, there needs no more

any

any to tell us what we know already. Again, make us not deſpair of an end of our differences, by aſſigning ſuch a method to end them, as ſuppoſes them firſt ended before it can be apply'd. For the meaning being once known, there is no difference for your Interpreter to end. Beſides, ſince while we differ, one of us has not the true meaning of Scripture, 'tis a ſtrange method to reconcile us, to refer us to what one of us has not, nor can have while we differ. I examine not with what propriety you ſpeak, though to be the Spirit, and to be dictated by the Spirit, ſeem different enough. But this is plain, that ſince the Spirit in the Books is to be interpreted, the Spirit interpreting muſt be out of the Books: And this our Controvertiſts will tell you is to be ſought for in the Church, to whom was promis'd the aſſiſtance of the ſame Spirit with which the Books were written. And to them I refer you, if you deſire to diſpute the Point farther, for I intend not to meddle with Controverſie. For the reſt of what you ſay of the myſtery of our diſagreement, who both agree in what we would be at, both condemn novelties, and deſire the Doctrine taught by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, 'tis a thing I muſt confeſs I wonder at as much as you, and can as little unriddle. *Inimicus homo hoc fecit*, is all I can ſay to it, and think our beſt remedy is to fall heartily to our prayers, and ſollicit the powerfull goodneſs of God, to throw down at laſt that wall of diviſion, whoſe foundation we are ſo far from being able to overthrow, that we cannot find where 'tis laid, nor upon what ground ſo miſchievous a building ſtands.

To come then at laſt to our purpoſe; I did I confeſs ſpeak but little of the firſt point, the Power of Princes immediately from God, and the little I ſaid I thought was more then needed, and muſt think ſo ſtill, it ſeeming to me a queſtion of ſo little importance either way, that what I ſhall add is only in obedience to your commands, which in my opinion might have imploy'd me in ſomething more uſefull. But ſince your curioſity will not otherwiſe be ſatisfi'd, let me tell you there are in this matter

ſeveral opinions of learned men, and all opinions only, and only of learned men, for the Church has not at all interpos'd, and I believe either the ſame or at leaſt as great variety is to be found amongſt you. Some hold that the Civil Power is given by God to the Community firſt, which afterwards chooſes the form of Government moſt pleaſing or moſt proper, and the perſons to manage it. So that they make it deriv'd from God immediately to the whole, and by their mediation to the Magiſtrates. There are who affirm as much of the Church, and ſay, that as God and Nature intend firſt and more immediately the whole then any part thereof, as ſight is given principally to the man, and to the eye as the inſtrument by which the man exerciſes it, ſo Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction is given principally and properly to the Church, to the Pope and Biſhops as inſtruments, and thoſe who are to execute it. Again, When a Prince is ſaid to have his Power immediately from God, ſome diſtinguiſh this word *immediately*, and granting that the Power to command their Subjects is immediately from God, which they ſay none denies, they affirm that to have theſe, and theſe Subjects, for example, the King of *France*, the *French*, of *Spain*, the *Spaniards*, &c. is not immediately from God, but by one of the four humane wayes by which Governments are introduc'd, Election, Inheritance, Gift or juſt Conqueſt. In which, ſay they, the caſe of the Pope and Secular Princes is different, for to St. *Peter*, and in him to his Succeſſors, all Chriſtians of whatever Nation or quality were immediately ſubjected by Chriſt, but for other Princes obedience to them when they are Princes, is immediately commanded by God, but where and over whom they ſhall be Princes, depends upon humane means. Others think this acuteneſs alters not the caſe, and ſay, that the Power of a Prince is one thing, and the Title which he has to this Power is another: that the Power is as immediately given to Princes as to the Pope, and that the Title to it is by humane means in both. For he has no Power but by the means of humane Election, more then Princes by Election, Inheritance,

ritance, or the reſt. And ſo they make the deſignation of the perſon to be by humane means, but the collation of Power immediately from God in both. And thus every one ſpeaks freely as his humour or learning ſerves, and I for my part ſee not that this freedom is prejudicial any way, for while we all agree we are to obey our Princes, and if we do not, we diſobey God, theſe ſubtleties, I conceive, are not much material. One thing there is, and but one that I can perceive which is of moment, and which I hinted in my former Letter, and that is, that Poſition, which makes the Power of the Prince deriv'd from the People, ſeems liable to this preſſing inconvenience, that they ſeem not to part ſo wholly with it, but in ſome caſes they reſerve a right to re-aſſume it again, as when Princes prove tyrannical, when the line fails, and the like. And this is a miſchief of which great care is to be taken, for one cannot eaſily find a greater. For if the People retain any Power, they muſt retain Judgement when to uſe it, and if they be Judges, when 'tis lawfull to oppoſe the Prince, when not, there is a gap opened to all manner of Sedition and Rebellion, or rather there can be no ſuch thing as Sedition or Rebellion in the world, at leaſt of the People. For when they oppoſe the Prince, 'tis a plain caſe by doing ſo they judge he is to be oppoſed, and if they be the Judges, they are no longer Rebels, but exerciſe a Power due to them; then which nothing can be more peſtiferous, and deſtructive of Government, and ruinous of the advantages mankind receives by it. Of which people may think as they pleaſe, but I believe the private men are they who reap the greateſt benefit by it, and are more happy then Princes whom many croſſy envy, and might peradventure more juſtly pity. For certainly to be ty'd to perpetual labour and care, and un-intermitted ſollicitude for the benefit of others, is a condition not much to be envy'd; and he, who ſecure of his life and fortune by the pains of other men, has nothing to do, but freely to purſue that courſe to which his inclination or advantage leads him, is in a condition much more deſirable.

Wherefore not only Princes, and all honeſt men with them, but all who are not ſtark fools, ought ſeriouſly to joyn to the preventing a miſchief ſo ruinous. Now as it is obvious and eaſily foreſeen, ſo there are ſeveral remedies which men have provided againſt it. Some affirm that when the People have once parted with their Power, and choſen to themſelves a Form of Government and Governours, they part with it for ever, and have no more to do but obey for the future, without any right of intermedling in any caſe with commanding; and this is pretty well, and renders the Government ſtable, and the Governours ſecure. Others think that they make all ſafe, by excluding the People from a capacity of being their own Judges, and reſerving that Prerogative to the common Father of Chriſtendom, who, they think, will take that care to which he is obliged for the good of his Children. But this is a little more, and in truth too much ſuſpicious, and does not take away the harm, but transfer the power of doing it into other hands. For the ſame Inconveniences may be fear'd from the Pope, as from the People; eſpecially where Princes are his enemies, as many profeſſedly are, and all may be, even thoſe of his own Communion: And comes ſo near that univerſal Temporal Monarchy which ſome have attributed to him, that I do not think, that any of his Adverſaries will admit it, or that his Friends will know how to maintain it. At leaſt for my part I do not. Others, and I think the moſt, both in number and Authority, take away all interpoſing of the People farther than to deſign the perſon as in Elections, or however they concur, but make the Princes power flow immediately from God, and ſo make it Sacred, and exclude both Pope and People, and all, but God himſelf from medling with it. And becauſe, this is the thing of which you deſire I ſhould diſcourſe, to thoſe Authorities already mentioned in my former Letter, I ſhall add as many more as I think may ſerve for your ſatisfaction.

In the firſt place, thoſe words of S. *Paul* ſeem deciſive of the queſtion, *Rom.* 13. 1. *There is no power but from God.*

For

For certainly it cannot consist with them, that Power should be from the People, or any else, but him. That exclusive word *Nisi* excludes all besides. Conformably speak the *Fathers*. Some I have mentioned before. I add *Epiphanius* Hæres. 40. *You see that this Worldly power is by God*; *or rather* ordinata ex Deo, *orderly and from God, and has the power of the Sword*, and not, *&c.* from any other *but God to revenge.* S. *Greg. Naz.* de Beatid. *Absolute Empire, and highest, full power subject to no other pleasure or dominion, belongs to Kingdoms.* Optatus L. 3. cont. Parmen. *Above the Emperour is* only *God who made the Emperour*, &c. Bruno Carthus. in *Rom.* 13. *There is no power, whether good or bad, but from God.* Hincmarus Ap. Bochel. in Decret. Eccl. *Gall.* speaking of King *Lotharius*, *He ought to be subject to the principality of God* alone, *from whom* alone *he could be placed in his own principality.* These more ancient Authors speak all, as the *Apostle* with a phrase of exclusion, plain enough; yet later speak plainer. Card. Cusanus L. 3. Concord. C. 5. *First, I presuppose what is known even to the Vulgar, that the Imperial Cessitude is independent of the Sacerdotal power, having an* immediate *dependence on God.* Dantes Aligh. de Monarch. has a whole Book to prove this position, and concludes, *Wherefore 'tis plain, that the Temporal Authority of a Monarch, is derived to him without any mediation from the fountain of Universal Authority.* Joan. de Parisiis de Potest. Regal. & Papal. *Both Powers proceed from one Supream power,* viz. *the Divine immediately.* Anton. de Rosell. Monar. part 1. p. 37. *Whence is inferr'd, that Cæsar depends of God* immediately. *Theodoric à Niem.* de Schism. L. 3. c. 7. *That Empire depends principally and* immediately *of God, appears by evident reasons.* de Offic. Princ. c. 5. *If the People were obliged to Obedience only in vertue of the consent to the Prince, their Disobedience would be said to be a breach of their agreement and promise; but not properly and directly of the Divine Ordinance, which, according to S.* Paul, *by Resistance is properly and immediately broken. For the Power which is resisted is ordain'd by God; so that now Rebellion ought not to be lookt upon as against Man, but against God. Tho. Waldensis* Tom. 1. l. 2. ar. 3. c. 78. after a whole Chapter to this purpose

pose concludes thus. *This we say that the Power of a King is only of God, given him* immediately *by God.* Victoria Relect. de potest. Civ. n. 8. *Kings have Power by Divine and natural Right, and* not *from the Commonwealth.* Those who write in behalf of the *Venetians*, in the Quarrel betwixt them and *Paul* the Fifth, laid this Doctrine for a ground-work, That the Power of temporal Princes, the Pope too amongst the rest, as he is a Temporal Prince, is given them by God immediately, and without exception. *Bellarmin* Answers, and reprehends that word *immediately*, but is pretty severely reprehended himself for his pains, and the expression justifi'd by the Authority of divers Catholic Doctors; as, *Navar*, *Durandus*, *Joan. Paris*, *Almain*, *Gerson*, &c. In fine he was so Answered, that he thought it better to have recourse to the Inquisition than to more Arguments, and so caused the Authours to be cited to *Rome.* But his Patrons deserted him not, and the Inquisition of *Venice* protected him against that of *Rome*, and the Doctrine remain'd not only unblemisht, but countenanc'd by the Protection of a very wise Commonwealth. Permit me to conclude this Point with an Authority, which with an *English* man may peradventure sway more than all the rest, It being a Declaration of Parliament, and that in Catholic times, That the Crown of *England* is, and alwaies has been, free and subject *immediately* to God and no other, in all that concerns the Regality thereof. 16. *Ric.* 2. Forreigners may talk as their fancy or Interest leads them, but I suppose a true English man will not easily be induc'd, to swerve from a Doctrine delivered him so Authentically by his famous Ancestours.

I hope by this time your Curiosity is at an end, I am sure my patience is, for I am quite tired with talking so long of a matter, which seems to me to afford little more advantage than to know, which of those Authors who treat this Subject, is the best Schollar, and talks most rationally. For as I said before, the Church has no waies interpos'd in the business, and possibly it is a thing not very proper for her to meddle with. She has receiv'd from Christ, and delivers to us, That Obedience to our

Princes

Princes is commanded by God, and to be performed, not only for Fear, but for Conſcience. And this being agreed by all, and acknowledged for unqueſtioned and unqueſtionable Truth; The reſt of the ſpeculations may ſerve for entertainment of thoſe who delight in them, and for the reſt ſeem of little concern, till people ſpeculate themſelves into oppoſition to that ſo certain, and ſo certainly known Doctrine; and then they turn not only bad Schollars but bad men, if they ſee what they do, however dangerous and as ſuch are to be treated.

For my part, I cannot gueſs what uſe you would make of this Immediate Power of which you are ſo curious, unleſs perhaps, you think the ſecurity of Kings not ſufficiently provided for without it, and that they may otherwiſe be oblig'd to render an account of their actions, not only to God, but to thoſe by whoſe mediation they have receiv'd their Power, and ſo a principal and neceſſary Prerogative taken from them. But this is ſo poſitively and expreſly ſetled by unqueſtionable Authority, that 'tis very needleſs, and rather prejudicial, to have recourſe to a ground which ſome queſtion, when the thing it ſelf is ſo unanimouſly agreed that none queſtions it. Witneſs S. *Cyril Alex.* in Joan. L. 12. C. 56. *None offend the laws of Kings without puniſhment but Kings themſelves, in whom this crime of prevarication has no place: for it was wiſely ſaid, that he is an impious man who ſaies to the King, You do wickedly.* S. Ambroſe Apolog. David. c. 10. *To Thee only have I ſinned; for he was a King ſubject himſelf to no Laws, becauſe Kings are free from the bonds of delinquency. For no Laws puniſh them who are ſafe by the power of their Empire, and he ſinned not to Man, to whom he was not accountable.* And Cap. 4. *They who are ſubject to Laws dare to deny their ſin, and ſcorn to aſk pardon, which he aſk'd who was ſubject to no humane Laws.* Again, L. 2. Ep. 7. *For ſupported by his regal dignity, as Lord of the Laws, he was not guilty to the Law; he was accountable to God alone, becauſe he is Lord of Power.* Again, upon *Pſal.* 118. Serm. 16. He who had not man to fear, ſaies, I have ſinned to *Thee alone*, &c. *A King, though he have Laws in his power, and*

may

may ſin without puniſhment, is nevertheleſs ſubject to God. S. *Hieron*, Ep. 46. ad Ruſtic. *I was a King and feared no other man; for he had no other above him.* V. *Bede* upon *Pſal.* 50. To *Thee alone have I ſinned.* For a King if he ſin, ſins only to God, for none elſe ſhall puniſh him for his ſin. *Agapet.* ad Juſtinian. in Parænet. *Impoſe upon your ſelf a neceſſity to keep the Laws, ſince you have not on earth who may correct you.* *Iſidor.* Hiſpal. Sent. L. 3. C. 50. *People that ſin fear the Judge, and are by the Laws reſtrained from their own harm. Kings, unleſs they be reſtrain'd by the only fear of God and Hell, run headlong on, and from the* precipice *of Licentious liberty fall into all ſorts of Vice.* Arnob. in *Pſal.* 50. *Whoever lives under the Law, when he offends, ſins againſt God, and alſo againſt the Laws of the World. But this King being under none but God alone, and only fearing him above his own power, ſinned to God alone.* *Didymus* Cat. Aurea in *Pſal.* 50. *As he was a King he was not ſubject to humane Laws, wherefore he ſinned not againſt them who made the Laws, nor committed this evil againſt any of them: but as to his Regal dignity, if he would be Vertuous he was ſubject to the Divine Law, and therefore ſinned to God alone.* *Lactantius* de Juſtit. L. 5. c. 24. *Let not bad Princes, and unjuſt Perſecutors, who ſcorn and ſcoff at the Name of God, think they ſhall ſcape without Puniſhment —— for they ſhall be puniſht by the Judgment of God —— He commands us patiently to expect that day of Divine Judgment, in which he will honour or puniſh every one according to his deſerts.* Gregory of Tours. L. 5. Hiſt. c. 17. *If any of us, O King, will ſtray from the path of Juſtice, he may be puniſht by you. But if you leave it your ſelf, who ſhall reprehend you? We ſpeak to you, and if you pleaſe you hear us: if you will not, who ſhall condemn you, but He who has declar'd himſelf to be Juſtice?* Hincmarus apud *Bochell.* Decret. Eccleſ. *Gallic.* L. 2. Tit. 16. c. 2. goes farther, and I know not, whether not too far. *Wiſe men, ſay this Prince, is ſubject to the Laws and Judgment of none but God, who made him King in that Kingdom which his Father allotted him: And if he will for this or any other cauſe, he may at his pleaſure go to the Synod, and if he will not, he may freely diſmiſs it. And as he ought not, whatever he do, be excommunicated by his own*

Biſhops;

Biſhops; ſo by other Biſhops he cannot be judged, ſince he ought be ſubject to the principality of God alone, by whom alone he could be placed in his own principality. For my part I cannot agree to the denyal of the power of Excommunicating in Biſhops: and yet St. *Auſtin* is cited, Gloſſ. in 13. *Math.* to ſay, *That the multitude is not to be Excommunicated, nor the Prince of the people.* *Euthimius* in *Pſal.* 50. *Being a King, and having you alone for Judge of the ſins I commit, I ſeem to have ſinn'd to you alone; that is, I am ſubject to you alone as my Judge; of all the reſt I my ſelf am Lord, and in reſpect of my power, it ſeems, I may do whatever I liſt.* *Haymo* in *Pſal.* 50. *I have ſinned to Thee alone: becauſe being a King, none is to puniſh my ſin but you alone.* St. *Thomas* 1, 2. Q. 96. Art. 5. making this Concluſion, That all are ſubject to the Laws; and this Objection from the Law, *That the Prince is free from the Law*, *Anſwers*, *That the Prince is free from the Law, for as much as concerns the Co-active power——— becauſe none can pronounce ſentence of Condemnation againſt him.* Wherefore the Gloſs upon *Pſal.* 50. ſaies, *That the King has no man who can judge his actions——— But is ſubject to the Law, as to the directive power, by his own proper will,* &c. And ſo without doubt, good Princes are, and will obſerve what themſelves command. But if they will not, and become bad, there is none according to S. *Thomas* who has power to condemn them. Alex. Alenſis in *Pſal.* 50. *I have ſinn'd to Thee alone: becauſe there is no other above me who can puniſh me. For I am a King, and none is above me but you alone.* And Part. 3. *A King is above all, and therefore to be judged by God alone, ſince he has not any man who can judge his actions, nor is to be puniſht by man. But if any of the People ſin, they ſin both againſt God and the King.* Nicholaus de Lyra. *I have ſinn'd to Thee alone as my Judge, and who has power to puniſh: for he had ſinned againſt Urias, and others ſlain upon this occaſion. Yet becauſe he was a King he had no ſuperiour Judge to puniſh him but God.*

Otho Friſingens Ep. ad Frederic. before his Chronic. *Whilſt no perſon is found in the world who is not ſubject to the Laws of the world, and by that ſubjection kept in awe; Kings alone, as being above Laws, and reſerved to the Divine Judgment, are not aw'd by the Laws of the world. Witneſs that both King and Prophet, I have ſinned to Thee alone.* Joan. de Turrenm. in *Pſal.* 50. *I have ſinn'd to Thee alone as my Judge, and who has power to puniſh me, becauſe Thou alone art above me who canſt judge my Crimes.* Dio Vega in conc. Veſpert. ſuper *Pſal.* 50. con. 2. *Wherefore leaving them, we muſt go the common way with the Fathers of the Church,* Hierom, Auſtin, Ambroſe, Chryſoſtome, *and* Caſſiodorus, *who ſay, that* David *therefore us'd theſe words, becauſe, being a Soveraign King, he was ſubject to none but God, accountable to the Laws of none, and none but God could puniſh his ſin. For a King though he be ſubject to the Directive power of the Law, yet is not to the Coactive.* Joan. de Pineda upon 34. *Job. For if a King or Prince will not willingly obey the Law, who can oblige, or by force conſtrain him?——— Yet let Princes underſtand at laſt, that if they do not of their own will keep the Law, they ſhall render an account to the Supream King, and be puniſht for the Violation of Juſtice.* I conclude with a Jeſuite, *Lorinus* upon *Pſal.* 50. *I have ſinn'd to Thee alone,* viz. *as alone knowing, or having power to puniſh his ſin who was a King, and had no Superiour——. None can ſay* Apoſtate *to a King, or call Judges wicked, unleſs he will be thought wicked himſelf, as* Chryſoſtom *and* Nicetas, *and* Cyril *in this place note.*

I hope by this time you will acknowledge it was a ſuperfluous care of yours for the ſecurity of Princes, if that were your reaſon, which made you ſo ſollicitous for the *immediate power.* For, whatever become of that, this is univerſally fixt, *That Kings are accountable to none but God.* And I think you need not much care what people ſay in a queſtion diſputed amongſt Learned men, when that for whoſe ſake you deſire it

ſhould

ſhould be reſolv'd, is it ſelf ſo fully reſolv'd to your hand.

To deal with ſincerity, I ſhould acquaint you, what ſhifts they make to eſcape the weight of this Authority, who undertake to abett a Power *paramount* in the Pope. But they are ſuch plain ſhifts, that in truth, I have not patience to inſiſt upon them. Some ſay this held among the *Jewiſh* Kings who were above the Prieſthood, but holds not among Chriſtians who are ſubject to it; as if *Chriſtian* Princes were leſs abſolute than thoſe of the *Jews*, or Chriſtianity took away the Right of any body, much leſs Princes. I alwaies thought, that much good had come to the world by Chriſtian Religion, and the concerns of Mankind went on more ſweetly and more ſtrongly; but that it ſhould be guilty of ſo great a miſchief as to ſhake the foundations of Government, ſo beneficial and neceſſary to humane Nature is a ſcandal, which methinks, a Chriſtian ear ſhould not hear with patience. And *Bellarmin*, give him his due, as much a favourer of the Pope as he is; in this yet is more a friend to Truth, and tells us, *De Rom. Pont.* L. 1. c. 29. *That the Goſpel deprives no man of his Right and Dominion, but gets him a new right to an eternal Kingdom: Nor have Kings leſs power in the New Teſtament, than they had in the old.* And yet He, with his diſtinctions betwixt Fact and Right, Power direct and indirect; with one whereof he ſtill endeavours to ward all blows, makes as mad work, and reduces things to as much confuſion. I ſhall ſay nothing to them more than to entreat you to be Judge your ſelf, and conſider whether, in what I have alledged, there be any room for thoſe Inventions, and whether the Doctrine be not delivered too plainly to be put off with ſuch evaſions.

And ſo I come to your *Second* Point; and for the fear you have of *Bellarmin*'s Argument, peradventure it were Anſwer enough to ſay, That S. *Bernard* under-

ſtood what was meant by the word *Feed*, as well at leaſt as *Bellarmin*, and he, notwithſtanding all the Cardinals acuteneſs, tells Pope *Eugenius*, L. 4. c. 3. that to *Feed* is to *Evangelize*. *Perform*, ſaies he, *the work of an Evangeliſt, and you have fulfilled the duty of a Paſtour*. Again, Serm. de Reſurrect. *Feed with your Mind, with your Mouth, with your Actions; feed with prayer of the Mind, exhortation of the Word, propoſal of Example.* I ſuppoſe no good Catholic, but will ſide with S. *Bernard* rather than *Bellarmin*; for as great a Schollar as *Bellarmin* was, he is not yet thought a match for S. *Bernard*. But neither is he alone of this mind. *Petrus Bleſenſis* ſaies almoſt in the ſame words, Ep. 148. *What is to Feed the Sheep, but to Evangelize, to render the People acceptable to God by Word, by Work, by Example.* And thus *Innocent* III. and a great many more are cited by *Caron*, to interpret this word *Feed*; ſo that all the Cardinal's ſubtle ſpeculations upon the metaphor us'd in the Goſpel, hinder not the Argument from being as inſignificant as you, and more beſides you to my knowledge think it. And if I have not yet ſaid enough to it, hearken a little to S. *Chryſoſt*. de Sacerd. L. 2. *It is not lawful for a man, to cure a Man with the ſame Authority with which a Shepheard cures his Sheep. For here it is free to bind and reſtrain from paſture, and burn and cut; There the Medicine and power of the cure is not in him who Adminiſters, but in him who is Sick.* But we ſhall hear more of him anon.

Mean time, ſince the Point you have propos'd, beſides your recommendation, deſerves in it ſelf more conſideration than this Argument. Let me tell you for your ſatisfaction, That thoſe who treat theſe things put many differences betwixt the Spiritual and Civil power, from the manner of Inſtitution, the ends at which they aim, the means they uſe to their ſeveral ends, *&c.* That which I conceive moſt to your purpoſe, is either grounded upon, or warranted by the

Inſtruction

Inſtruction left by S. *Peter* to his fellow Paſtours, in theſe words, 1 *Pet.* 5. *Feed the flock of God which is among you, providing not by conſtraint, but willingly according to God, neither for filthy lucre ſake but voluntarily, neither as over-ruling the Clergy, but made Examples of the flock from the heart.* From theſe words ſome gather this difference betwixt the Spiritual and Temporal Power, that the one is accompanied with the power of Conſtraint, the other not; I know the word *Coacte* is ſometimes expounded otherwiſe; and that ſome, and in particular *V. Bede*, underſtand by it the excluſion of that Mercenary intereſt, which in ſervice ſome propoſe to themſelves, while others ſerve for Love. And this ſence is without doubt a good and a true one; but I know not whether the Apoſtle meant it, though peradventure he, or rather his Inſpirer might, according to S. *Auſtin*'s Rule, That all the Truth was meant by God which is contained in the words he Inſpired. Otherwiſe, that ſeems to be the import of the Second Branch, *Not for lucre but voluntarily*; and this Interpretation, with a needleſs *tautology*, makes the two branches ſignifie but one thing, which the Apoſtle ſeems nevertheleſs to diſtinguiſh. However it be, conſidering that before S. *Peter* Chriſt himſelf puts *Dominion* and *non-dominion*, for the difference betwixt Secular and Spiritual Power. *The Kings of the Gentiles have dominion over them—— but you not ſo. Luke* 22. 25. And that S. *Paul* tells the *Corinthians, The arms of his warfare are not carnal. Cor.* 10. I conceive that whatever S. *Peter* meant, this doctrine is very true, that Force and Conſtraint belong only to the Civil Magiſtrate, and not to the Spiritual: I mean in vertue of his being a Spiritual Magiſtrate; for theſe Formalities, of which you profeſs'd ſo much diſlike, return again in ſpight of my teeth, and there is no diſcourſing without them. Otherwiſe, the man who is a Spiritual Magiſtrate may upon other accounts juſtly have, and juſtly uſe Conſtraint; nay,

it

it may be his due in consideration of his Spiritual Magistracy, but not originally deduc'd from thence, but annexed to it, or accrued by other means. According to S. *Bernard*, mentioned in my last: *Not by right of Apostleship.* Now if I can make out to you, that it may irreprovably be held in our Church, that this Spiritual Power, of which you are so jealous, cannot use Force or Constraint upon any man, I hope you will have no cause of complaint against it, nor fewel for those fears which still disquiet you. For certainly, a Power which cannot use Force is a little dangerous. If it can perswade you to what it would, you then act by your Inclination or Choice; but if it cannot, you are free to do what you will: And I think, you would not wish to be more safe. Consider then, what men they are whom they must reprove, who will reprove this Doctrine. And first, S. *Hierom* delivers it very plainly, Epitaph. Nepot. Ep. 3. *We must obey the Bishop as the King, nay the Bishop less than the King, for he is over the unwilling, the Bishop over the willing. One subjects by Fear, the other is given to Service; One imprisons the Body to death, the other preserves the Soul to life.* S. Greg. Nazian. Apologet. *We ought not to constrain by Force or Necessity, but perswade by Reason and Example of our lives.* Again, *Our Law and Law-maker have especially provided, that the flock be fed not by constraint, but freely and willingly.* And, Orat. 1. cont. Jul. Apost. *These things* Julian *had in his mind, as those who were privy to his secrets discovered; but he was restrained by the clemency of God, and the tears of the Christians, whereof many, and by many had, now been shed, since this was their only remedy against a Persecutor.* S. *Jo. Chrysost.* in Act. Hom. 3. comparing the care of a Bishop with the care of a Father, makes that of a Bishop much more heavy, as having more Children and less Power. *What*, saies he, *will not the Bishop endure who has so many not of his household Family, but whose Obedience is in their own power.* A-

gain:

gain: *The Emperour has command over the whole world, the Bishop is Bishop only of one City, and yet he has as much more care as there is difference betwixt a River stir'd with the wind, and the Sea swelling and raging. Why so? because there are there more helps, since all things are perform'd by Laws and Commands, here is no such thing; for it is not lawful to command by Authority.* Hom. 10. in 1. Thessalon. *A Father both by Natural and Civil Laws, uses his Child with much freedome. If he instruct him against his will, if he strike him none hinders him, nor dares the Son himself look up. A Priest has much difficulty: for first he must rule those that are willing to be ruled, and whom by his government he is to please. Again, We domineer not over your Faith, Beloved, nor order these things by the right of command and dominion. To us is commended the speech of Doctrine, not the Authority of Power and Principality. We hold the place of Counsellors and Exhortors: He who counsels when he delivers his opinion, forces not the hearer to accept it, but leaves in his power the free choice of what is to be done.* And Hom. 1. in Ep. ad Tit. *I omit to say that a Bishop cannot with truth be called a Prince. Why? Because it is in the Power of their Subjects to obey, or not.* Again, De Sacerdot. L. 2. *External Judges when they find wicked men who have transgrest the Laws, shew themselves endued with great Power and Authority, and force them to change their manners whether they will or no. But here we must not use force but only perswade, and by that means make him become better whose cure we have undertaken. For neither have we any Power given by Law to force Delinquents, and if we had, we have not whereon to exercise this force and Power, since Christ gives an eternal Kingdom to those, who not by force but by a firm resolution of the soul abstain from sin. Wherefore there is need of much art, that Christians who are ill-affected will perswade themselves that they ought submit to the cure of Priests.* Again, upon these words in the last to the Heb. Hom. Ult. *Obey your Prelates*, that they may do this with joy, not lamenting

ing

ing, &c. *You ſee that when an* Eccleſiaſtical *Prince is contemned, he ought not return revenge, but all his revenge is to weep and ſigh.* And upon Iſa. 6. Hom. 4. *The King forces, the Prieſt exhorts; He with neceſſity, this by counſel; He has ſenſible, this ſpiritual arms,* &c. S. *Auſt.* de fide & oper. C. 2. ſays, *The material ſword uſed in the Old Teſtament by* Moyſes *and* Phinees, *was a figure of the degradations and excommunications to be exerciſed in the New, when in the diſcipline of the Church, the viſible ſword ſhould ceaſe.* Origen Tract. 12. in Mat. *Jeſus taking occaſion from the two Brothers, who ſought to be advanc'd above the other Apoſtles with indignation of the reſt, ſettles the Rule of juſtice to the faithfull, how a man may obtain the firſt place with God. The Princes of the Gentiles not content only to Rule their Subjects, ſeek violently to Command them. But with you who are mine, this ſhall not be. Leaſt they perhaps who ſeem to have Principality in the Church, ſhould domineer over their Brethren, or exerciſe power upon them. For as all Carnal things are by neceſſity not willingneſs, and Spiritual by willingneſs not neceſſity; ſo the principality of Spiritual Princes ought to be placed in the Love, not Corporal fear of their Subjects.* And after he had ſpoken much of the Humility befitting Prelates, leaſt he ſhould be thought an enemy to their true Power, he ſo Anſwers that Objection that withal he explicates wherein that Power conſiſts, Adding, *This I ſay not to debaſe the Eccleſiaſtical Principality. For it is ſometimes fit, according to the Apoſtolical Inſtruction, publickly to rebuke ſinners that the reſt may be afraid. It is ſometimes fit he ſhould uſe his Power* (What is that?) *and deliver the Sinner over to Satan to the deſtruction of the fleſh, that his ſpirit may be ſaved in the day of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Yet this is ſeldome to be done. For the Unquiet are to be reprehended, the Puſillanimous to be comforted, the Weak to be ſuſtained, Magnanimity ſhew'd to all.* Reprehenſion then, and Excommunication, are the things in which *Origen* thought the Spiritual Power conſiſted. S. *Ambroſe* Orat. in Auxent.

ent. *Againſt Weapons and Souldiers of the* Goths *I may grieve, I may weep, I may ſigh. My Weapons are my Tears: for ſuch are the defence of a Prieſt. To reſiſt in any other manner I neither ought, nor can.* S. *Bernard.* de Conſid. L.2. *S.* Peter *could not give what he had not, what he had that he gave the care, as I ſaid, over the Churches. Did he give Dominion too? Hear himſelf; Not domineering, ſaies he, in the Clergy, but being made the Example of the flock. And that you may not think this was ſaid only for humility, not for truth: it is the ſaying of our Lord in the Goſpel, The Kings of Gentiles have dominion over them, and who have Power upon them are called beneficial, and infers, but you not ſo. 'Tis plain Dominion is forbid to Apoſtles. Go you now and dare to uſurp either with Dominion the Apoſtleſhip, or with the Apoſtleſhip Dominion.* Aut Dominans Apoſtolatum, aut Apoſtolicus Dominatum. *You are plainly forbid the one. If you will have both together, you will loſe both. Otherwiſe think not your ſelf exempted from the number of thoſe of whom God complains; ſo they have reigned but not by me. They have been Princes, and I knew them not. Now if you will reign without God, you have glory but not with God. Dominion is forbidden, Miniſtry is commanded.* Again, *Girt your ſword to you, the ſword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God.* And L.4. *Set upon them with the Word, not the ſword.* S. *Anſelm* in 26 Mat. *Note that there are two ſwords in the Church, one material, the other ſpiritual, but the ſpiritual conſtrains only the willing, the material the unwilling too.* And note withall, that the Saint by *Church* means materially not formally, that is, that amongſt Chriſtians and the faithfull, as well as Infidels, there is the power of life and death, and they are of the Church who have it, not that it belongs to them as they are of the Church. *Pet. de Aliaco de Reſumpt. Concl.* 1. anſwering ſome Arguments brought to prove, that the ſpiritual Power extends it ſelf to Temporals: *To all theſe things may be ſaid, that they are to be underſtood not of the judgement of*

 Coaction,

Coaction, but the judgement of Discretion; nor that they belong to the Clergy, not by natural and divine Right, but humane Laws, and concession of Kings or Emperors. And Concl. 4. *To those who teach the Clergy may make Laws in Civil matters and Rules, according to which Princes are obliged to judge and govern, I insist not upon it, because they say it purely, voluntarily, and without alledging Authentical Scripture.* Again, C. de Reform. Laic. & Princ. Consi. 6. *The Church cannot temporally constrain Princes to reform these things.* Gul. Orhum. Dial. Par. 1. L. 6. C. 9. *The Pope as Vicar of Christ has Power of Excommunication, but not to inflict any greater punishment.* Joan. Ferus L. 3. Comment. in Mat. 16. I will give Thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: *These are not material Keys, but signifie metaphorically* Power. Peter *therefore receiv'd Power, not any earthly Power that he could give or take away, or alienate Kingdoms,* &c. *but the Power to bind and loose, to remit and retain sins, to open and shut; and this not arbitrarily neither, but as a Minister to execute the will of God.* This *Ferus* by the way is in the Index of prohibited Books; but these Commentaries printed at *Rome* are excepted out of the prohibition, which because I have not, I thought convenient to tell you so. *Anton. de Rosell. de Potest. Imp. & Pap. Par.* 1. *C.* 38. *Whence is gathered that Secular Power never was in Christ nor his Successors; which is confirm'd by the Authority of* Bede, *when upon that of St.* Mat. *he says, Amongst you who are mine, violent dominion shall not be. For as all carnal things are placed in necessity, spirituals in voluntariness, so spiritual Princes have their principalities in love not fear: But those who have carnal Coercion should fear that of the Apostle,* Rom. 13. *If you do ill, fear, namely, the Secular Power, because their weapons are wars. The sword therefore is not permitted to the Pope.* This *Rosellis* is got into the Index too, *Donec expurgetur*; of which if I had reflected when I writ my last, I had told you so much: But because he cites *V. Bede,* who it seems had learnt his Doctrine

ctrine from *Origen* and St. *Ambroſe*, I put him in. I ſee theſe Authors freely cited by Catholicks, and while they ſpeak conformably to the Fathers and Popes themſelves, know not why they ſhould be rejected. You have in the former Letter from *Leo* 4. that corporal puniſhments belong to Kings, ſpiritual to Prieſts. From *Nicol.* 2. That the Church of God hath no ſword but the ſpiritual. I add *Joan.* 8. *Cap. Porro* 16. *Q.* 3. *The Church unacquainted with corporal Arms, patiently expects mercy from her only Lord and Defender when he pleaſes.* And *Celeſtin.* 3. *C. cum ab homine. Extrau. de Judiciis* teaches us, that if a Clergy-man remain after Depoſition and Excommunication ſtill incorrigible, *ſince the Church has not Power to do more, he is to be reſtrained by the Secular Power, and baniſhment or ſome other lawfull puniſhment inflicted.* And this ſeems to me very evident from the Cuſtom of the Church even at this day, when if a Clergy-man be found guilty of a crime which deſerves death, they deliver him degraded over to the Secular Magiſtrate to receive him. I know that ſome would have this to proceed only from the prohibition of the Canons, which for decency forbid the Clergy to meddle with blood. But by their favour, conſidering the unanimous Doctrine of the Fathers before delivered, I cannot think but the true indecency is the want of power, or in St. *Bernard*'s language, their thruſting their Sickle into other mens Harveſt. Otherwiſe an action truely vertuous ſeems far from indecent, and to purge the Commonwealth of a bad Member is not only a vertue, but a neceſſary one too, and ſuch as the Commonwealth cannot ſubſiſt without. Not only the Judge, but the Executioner too may be Saints for all the ſeverity of their Offices, and I ſhould think that things which conſiſt with vertue ought not be thought miſ-becoming, and what are neceſſary cannot. So that I muſt needs believe this Cuſtom of

the Church implies her ſence, that her Power is at an end when ſhe has us'd her ſpiritual rod, Excommunication; and if any more be fit to be done, ſhe muſt have recourſe to temporal Power; which if it think not fit to proceed, I know not why they are not at their liberty.

This is what occurs to me in Anſwer to the point you propos'd. I hope it will prove ſatisfactory, and fully quiet the jealouſie you have of the ſpiritual Power. For certainly there cannot be a more unreaſonable fear in the world, then to fear that which you know can do you no harm. That men ſhould be in the world impowr'd to declare to us the commands of God, and way to Heaven, and preſs them by efficacious perſwaſion upon us, and take all opportunities in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon to that purpoſe, is ſo far from prejudicial to mankind, that we cannot fancy a greater nor more needed Good. And if you will take it away, you muſt take mankind away too. For if our nature require we be govern'd by reaſon, it requires too that men be permitted to ſhew it us when we ſee it not of our ſelves. If perſwaſion and exhortation be thought harmfull to men, our nature is fram'd very ill upon which thoſe harmfull things are in proper means to work, all commerce and all ſociety muſt end when theſe things are forbidden. For what uſe is there of converſation, if it become unlawfull for me to perſwade another man to his own or my good? If it were not folly to dilate a point ſo plain, what might not be ſaid of it? Farther; if men become obſtinate, and will not hear reaſon, it is very natural and very fit they ſhould be reclaim'd if it may be, by openly ſhewing them their fault, and making them ſenſible they are in the wrong, which if they be, 'tis fit they ſhould amend, or if they be not, the company before whom the repreſenſion is made,

will

will ſee it, and take their parts. And he who reprehends them wrongfully will incur the ſhame intended for them. So that by this Power none will run the hazard, ſo much as of ſhame, but thoſe whoſe obſtinacy in ſin truly deſerves it. Indeed, I have not known this Power put in practice, whether we owe the diſcontinuance of it to the Laws or Confeſſion; but 'tis plain 'tis in the Church, and good for Mankind, it ſhould be ſo. After this, if the Sinner remain yet obſtinate what remains, but that vertuous men and the Church ſhould have no more to do with him, who will not do good to himſelf, and may do harm to others; but look upon him, in our Saviours language, as an *Ethnic* and *Publican*, and have no Commerce and Communication with him, till Repentance reſtore him to his former condition? In which I take the ſubſtance of Excommunication to conſiſt. And this I conceive is ſo far from harm, that, I ſuppoſe, you will make no difficulty to allow it all; not only ours, but all who pretend to the title of a Church; claiming thus much Power at leaſt. For, that which you only do, and only can fear, that this Spiritual Power ſhould go too far, and look upon the diſpoſing of Kingdoms and altering Commonwealths, as things within her reach; I hope I have brought you ſufficient evidence to make you ſee, that the All-fore-ſeeing Providence of our Wiſe Law-maker has provided abundantly for your ſecurity, in diſtinguiſhing the two Powers, and putting them into ſeveral hands; and committing the Spiritual Sword to the Church, the Material to the Prince. For if the Spiritual Power cannot uſe Force, and be only over the Willing, and ſuch as may chuſe whether they will obey or no; which you ſee the Fathers plainly affirm, there is no poſſible fear from it. If any encroachments be made to the prejudice of other mens Rights, we have

have the ſame ſecurity againſt them as againſt all Injuries, the Protection of our Prince oblig'd to defend us, and arm'd with Power to do it. We are taught, He bears not the Sword in vain. And we ſee by experience he does not. For, notwithſtanding theſe flattering Poſitions, which you make ſo terrible, Princes know well enough how to preſerve themſelves and their Subjects from receiving any harm from them. So Catholics have done in all times, and ſo they do ſtill. 'Tis true, they are generally willing enough to gratifie the Pope, with permitting any thing to be ſaid in his favour; and ſhew that reſpect to the Common Father of Chriſtendom, as to let him, and thoſe who are addicted to him, ſay even what they pleaſe. But yet they do as they think fit: And make no difficulty to Aſſemble National Councels, and ſettle even Eccleſiaſtical Affairs with their own Biſhops; nay, to make War upon the Pope himſelf. And while they uſe the Sword, are juſtified ſtill by the Pens of Learned men who take their parts. For all this, they leave not off their reſpect to their Church, but ſo proſecute their Civil concerns, that they leave the Rights of the Church untoucht; and make Peace with ſo much reputation to the Pope, that they refuſe not ſometimes to ask pardon, even when they are the perſons wrong'd. But while they give this reſpect to the Vicar of Chriſt, they leave not for all that to do their buſineſs, and preſerve their own Rights. And while they keep the Sword in their own hands, let the Pope talk as he pleaſes, think themſelves ſecure enough. They apprehend no great danger from *Solligiſms*, which they can uſe at any time, as *Alexander* did the *Gordian* knot. Notwithſtanding, ſince it may be dangerous to a Prince, that the minds of his Subjects be poſſeſt with falſe Doctrines, eſpecially in matters concerning Religion, which men generally prefer before Allegiance, according

according to that, *Æquum eſt Deo magis obedire quam Regi* (though in truth, Religion and Allegiance can never interfare,) it might concern the prudence of Princes to take that care in theſe matters which is fitting. But I am no Counſellour, and my condition obliges me to think they do. I have ſhew'd you what the Sentiments of the Fathers, and the Church are; for the reſt it belongs not to me. This which I have done, being only to obey your Commands, and teſtifie the power you have over

Your, &c.